REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following amendments and remarks. Claims 1, 5, 10, and 11 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-11 are pending.

I.   Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0084292 filed by Pierce at al. (hereinafter "Pierce") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0088783 filed by DiPierro (hereinafter "DiPierro").

Claim 1, among other limitations, recites the limitations of an "the timestamp includes a creation time and an expiration time of the security information of the SOAP message." The amendment is supported, for example, by page 7, lines 1-3, of the Specification. Pierce fails to teach or suggest these elements. Instead, Pierce simply teaches that the expiration time of the token is included in the token rather than "a creation time and an expiration time," as recited in the claim. See Pierce, paragraph [0076]. As a result, Pierce fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 1. Further, DiPierro fails to teach or suggest these missing elements. Instead, DiPierro discloses that the digital signature may be stored in the file header, but fails to teach anything related to a timestamp. See DiPierro, paragraph [0039]. Thus, in view of these foregoing reasons, Pierce in view of DiPierro fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

In regard to claims 2-4, these claims depend from claim 1 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 1, Pierce in view of DiPierro fails to teach or suggest each element of these claims. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4.

In regard to 10, this claim, as amended, recites analogous limitations to those in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 1, Pierce in view of DiPierro fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 10. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10.

Claims 5 and 11, as amended, recite the elements of "acquiring a certificate *from a security token in the security header of the SOAP header* for verifying a signature of the SOAP message," and "decrypting encrypted data in the SOAP body with the secret key of the step (b), and restoring original data, *wherein the original signature is used to prove integrity of the SOAP message and verify identification*" (emphasis added). Support for the amendment may be found, for example, on page 4, lines 20 and 22, and page 7, lines 8-10, of the Specification. Pierce fails to teach or suggest these elements. As recited in the claims, a digital signature described in the present invention is what is used to prove the integrity of the SOAP message and to verify identification. Therefore, it should be understood that the digital signature of the present invention is unrelated to the data included in the SOAP body, and is not calculated from the data. In contrast, the token taught in Pierce fails to include a certificate as recited in claims 5 and 11. Rather, the token in Pierce only includes an encrypted session key and other connection data. See Pierce, paragraph [0076]. As a result, Pierce fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 5 and 11.

Moreover, DiPierro fails to teach or suggest the missing elements. In contrast to the digital signature of the present invention, a digital signature disclosed in DiPierro comprises a string of authentication data generated from a string of actual data, corresponding to the data in the SOAP body in the present invention (see paragraph [0041], [0042], [0044], [0058], [0071], [0072] and FIG. 7). Therefore, the digital signature of DiPierro is similar to a parity bit being used in a typical manner. The Applicants believe that the digital signature of the present invention is more analogous to a user signature disclosed in DiPierro (see paragraph [0062], [0069] and [0070]). However, the user signature in DiPierro is not encrypted together with the data as required by the claims. Consequently, the digital signature as recited in claims 5 and 11 differs from the digital signature of DiPierro. Therefore, for at least these reasons, DiPierro fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 5 and 11.

Thus, in view of these foregoing reasons, Pierce in view of DiPierro fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 5 and 11. In addition, claims 6-9 are patentable over the cited art because of their dependencies on claim 5. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-9 and 11.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-11 patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: November 20, 2007   By: _____

Eric S. Hyman, Registration No. 30,139

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 20, 2007.

Melissa Stead   November 20, 2007